

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated May 14, 2008, in which the Examiner objected to the Abstract and rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for acknowledgement of the priority papers. However, Applicant respectfully points out that box 12a 3 should be indicated rather than box 12a 1 on the Office Action summary PTOL-326.

As indicated above, the Abstract has been amended to correct minor informalities. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the objection to the Abstract.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 12 have been amended for stylistic reasons. The amendments are unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims.

Claim 1 claims an interleaving device and claim 12 claims an interleaving method. The device and method include a first interleaving means/step performing folding interleaving on first data comprised of plural input packets, in units of a data word or plural consecutive data words. A second interleaving means/step performs interleaving, in units of a packet, on second data output/generated by the first interleaving means/step. The second data is comprised of plural packets.

By performing interleaving on second data output/generated by a first interleaving means/step as claimed in claims 1 and 12, claimed invention provides an interleaving device and method which can correct a significant burst error using an error correction code having a small code length. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 12.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sako* (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,088).

Sako appears to disclose interleavers 3a or 3b selected based upon a disk ID by a selection circuit 4. (Co. 6, lines 31-48). FIG. 5 shows a feed-encoding process having interleavers 3a and 3b selected by selecting circuit 4. Also disclosed are interleavers 7a and 7b selected by selecting circuit 8 (Col. 8, lines 30-62). FIG. 6 discloses an error-correcting encoding process in which input symbols are supplied to a C1 encoder 105. The output of the encoder is supplied to a C2 encoder 102 through a delay circuit group 103a for interleaving process. The C2 encoder 102 generates a C2 parity Q. The C1 encoder 105 encodes not only data, but the C2 parity with the C1 code. Thus, the C2 parity Q is fed back from the C2 encoder 102 to the C1 encoder 105 through the delay circuit group 107a for the interleaving process (Col. 9, lines 18-30).

Thus, *Sako* merely discloses interleavers 7a, 7b, 107a, receiving an input from encoder C2 102. Nothing in *Sako* shows, teaches or suggests a second interleaving means/step performing interleaving on second data output/generated by a first interleaving means/step as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Rather, interleavers 107a, b, 107a of *Sako* perform interleaving on the output from encoder C2 (and not from interleaver 3a, b, 103a).

Since nothing in *Sako* shows, teaches or suggests performing interleaving on data output/generated by a first interleaving means/step as claimed in claims 1 and 12, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2-11 and 13-22 depend from claims 1 and 12 and recite additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-11 and 13-22 would not have been anticipated by *Sako* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-11 and 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 05-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: August 25, 2008

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530